

Summary of Vapor Workgroup Discussions and Next Steps		
General Topic Area	Recap/Status	Next Steps
Screening Levels/Air Cleanup Levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecology has discussed risk-related issues with MTCA/SMS Advisory Group and MTCA Science Panel (March 2010). Ecology obtained responses from Vapor Workgroup on five questions. The responses were compiled and discussed at June 24th meeting. There appeared to be general agreement on several issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MTCA rule should be consistent with EPA toxicological information hierarchy (OSWER Directive 9285.7-53). Ecology should post VI screening levels on web (perhaps in CLARC database) instead of the VI guidance document or rule. Ecology should revise the MTCA rule to incorporate current EPA inhalation risk guidelines. Ecology should update the definition of “carcinogen” to reflect current EPA cancer risk guidelines. Ecology has prepared a document outlining draft decisions and rationale for several risk assessment issues. This document (Science Policy Choices Underlying Updates to MTCA Cleanup Levels) is being distributed to the MTCA/SMS Advisory Group. Ecology has begun to prepare draft rule revisions (Sections -708 and -750) that reflect feedback from Vapor Workgroup, MTCA/SMS Advisory Group and MTCA Science Panel on these risk assessment issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are a few remaining issues that require further evaluation and discussion as Ecology develops draft rule revisions. These include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consideration of adult/child differences with the EPA risk guidance; Use of Cal EPA toxicity values; Aligning air cleanup levels/screening levels with different land use scenarios; Substance specific issues such as screening levels for the various petroleum fractions. Prepare and discuss draft revisions to WAC 173-340-750 (Air Cleanup Levels) with Vapor Workgroup and MTCA/SMS Advisory Group. Prepare and discuss draft revisions to WAC 173-340-708 (Human Health Risk Assessment) with Vapor Workgroup and MTCA/SMS Advisory Group.
Investigations and Evaluations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecology has reviewed public comments on draft VI guidance. Generally favorable response – some changes/clarifications needed (Fall 2009) Ecology prepared and discussed outline for new rule section(s) with Vapor Workgroup at May 13th meeting. Ecology prepared and distributed draft rule language for Vapor Workgroup review and discussion (see attachment to this summary table) Two members (Chris Waldron and Patty Boyden/Parametrix team) discussed experiences investigating and responding to VI problems at Washington sites. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The draft rule language includes 4 relatively short rule sections that would be inserted near the remedial investigation/feasibility study requirements. The draft rule revisions are based on the tiered decision process that is presented in the VI guidance document. Ecology hopes discuss draft rule provisions with the Vapor Workgroup in early August. Ecology is interested in feedback on both: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of detail (rule vs not rule. If not rule, then what?: guidance , tech memo, web-based guidance such as CLARC) Content of the draft rule provisions.

Decisions on Further Actions (FA) and No Further Actions (NFA) when vapor intrusion is an issue at a property or site.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Vapor Workgroup identified priority issues and concerns at May 13th meeting. There appeared to be general agreement that rule revisions/guidance is needed on remedy selection and compliance. Issues:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• What factors/lines of evidence should be considered when deciding whether actions are needed to prevent or minimize a vapor intrusion problem?• What factors/lines of evidence should be considered when deciding that no further action is needed to address a vapor intrusion problem?• What types of institutional controls are needed to support active or passive ventilation systems?• How should decision-makers take into account indoor and outdoor background concentrations?• The Vapor Work Group has some limited discussion on weight of evidence and background levels at June 24th meeting.• Two members (see above) made presentations at the July 16th meeting and led discussions on issues faced at cleanup sites and approaches used to reach decisions on the vapor intrusion pathway.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Minor miracle occurs – Ecology and Vapor Workgroup identify rule changes and/or guidance materials that will facilitate decisions on vapor intrusion problems (including multiple lines of evidence, background levels, use of institutional controls and environmental covenants, etc.)
--	--	--